UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,749	07/18/2003	Donald David Karlov	MSFT-1786/303768.1	3141

41505   7590   08/10/2006

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA   19103

EXAMINER
HSU, JONI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action ***Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***	10/622,749	KARLOV, DONALD DAVID
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joni Hsu	2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>23 June 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

     Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

     NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.

6. ☒ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>1,2,5-19 and 22-36</u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: <u>1,2,5-19 and 22-36</u>.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: <u>37 and 38</u>.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

[signature]

ULKA CHAUHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 U.S.C.

103(a) rejections of Claims 1, 2, 6-16, 18, 19, 23-29, and 36.

Continuation of 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be

found in a prior Office action.

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shetter (US006342890B1) in view of Nobutani (US005613103A), further in view of

Chauvel (US004814756A), further in view of Goldberg (US005877779A).

Shetter describes a method for updating an image on a computer display device,

the method comprising logically dividing the image into a plurality of zones (*blocks of*

source sub-pixels to be accessed are shifted to account for a left side bearing remainder

in the final display of the character, Col. 5, lines 1-5).

However, Shetter does not teach tracking which zones are revised and updating

only the revised zones on the image. However, Nobutani describes a method for

updating the image on a computer display device, the method comprising tracking which

zones are revised; and updating only the revised zones on the display device (*execute a*

partial rewrite of updating only the changed display data on the display screen, Col. 1,

lines 50-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of

invention by applicant to modify the device of Shetter to include tracking which zones

are revised and updating only the revised zones on the image as suggested by Nobutani

because Nobutani suggests that this increases the processing speed (Col. 1, lines 50-54; *rewrites executed for unnecessary lines lowers the processing speed*, Col. 2, lines 45-47).

However, Shetter and Nobutani do not teach storing each zone of the plurality of zones by a starting point of each zone, and tracking the revised zones using the starting point of each revised zone. However, Chauvel describes storing each zone of the plurality of zones by a starting point of each zone, and tracking the zones using the starting point of each zone (Col. 3, lines 31-44, Col. 3, line 59-Col. 4, line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the devices of Shetter and Nobutani to include storing each zone of the plurality of zones by a starting point of each zone, and tracking the revised zones using the starting point of each revised zone as suggested by Chauvel because Chauvel suggests the advantage of being able to easily find and retrieve the zones (Col. 3, line 59-Col. 4, line 3).

However, Shetter, Nobutani, and Chauvel do not teach system random access memory used for logically dividing the image into a plurality of zones for tracking revised zones using the starting point of each revised zone is allocated at startup. However, Goldberg discloses that the system memory used for performing an operation is allocated at startup (Col. 9, lines 14-18, 50-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the devices of Shetter, Nobutani, and Chauvel so that system random access memory used for logically dividing the image into a plurality of zones for tracking revised zones using the starting point of each revised zone is allocated at startup as suggested by Goldberg because Goldberg suggests the advantage of the

operating system being configured so that the software, or a user or programmer, may specify any sized portion of the memory for allocation so that the region of memory is reserved before processing has begun (Col. 5, lines 13-30).